

PATENT  
10/058,300

#### D. REMARKS

##### *Specification*

Applicants have amended the specification above to include the application serial numbers of the related cross-references.

##### *Interview Summary*

On December 6, 2004 2 PM EST, an interview was conducted via telephone between Amy Pattillo, Applicants' Representative, and Examiner Zhou. No exhibits were shown, nor demonstrations conducted.

First, Applicants' representative and the Examiners discussed claim 1, and in particular a proposed amendment to claim 1. Specifically, the prior art cited against claim 1 is Strasnick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,555,354). Applicants representative argued that Strasnick et al. only teaches a part of a chart, in a window, that adjusts in three-dimensional height to represent the activity of a file system. In contrast, the proposed amendment describes the scope of an "application image" that is adjusted in height to represent the activity of an application, where an application image is further described wherein "a user selection of said application image triggers one action from among opening a graphical window in said graphical interface in association with said application and closing said graphical window in said graphical interface in association with said application." The Examiner requested additional clarification of the "application image" element. No agreement was reached with respect to claim 1. Applicant is filing this response for further review by the Examiner.

##### *35 USC § 102(b)*

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Strasnick et al. (US Patent 5,555,354) (hereinafter referred to as Strasnick). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2

AUS920010522US1

12

PATENT  
10/058,300

USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Furthermore the reference must be an enabling disclosure of each and every element as set forth in the claim. *In re Hoeckma*, 158 USPQ 596, 600 (CCPA 1968); *In re LeGrive*, 133 USPQ 365, 372 (CCPA 1962). Applicants request allowance of claims 1-24 in view of the amendments and arguments hereafter.

#### Claims 1, 9 and 17

With respect to claims 1, 9, and 17, the Examiner cites Strasnick as teaching the method, system and program of claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. [Office Action, p. 2] In particular, amended claim 1 currently reads:

**1.(Currently Amended)** A method for displaying application activity, said method comprising the steps of:

detecting at least one type of activity for an application represented in a graphical interface by an application image and interfaced with through a graphical window, wherein said application image indicates said application is running independent of whether said graphical window for user interfacing with said application is currently open within said graphical user interface associated with an application open in a graphical interface; and

graphically adjusting a three-dimensional height of said application image in said graphical interface to represent said at least one type of activity, such that said at least one type of activity is graphically distinguished for an application.

In the rejection to claim 1, the Examiner cites Strasnick as teaching the element of “detecting at least one type of activity for an application image associated with an application open in a graphical interface” at col. 2, lines 15-32 and col. 7, lines 9-18. [Office Action, p. 2] In particular, the Examiner cites col. 2, lines 15-32 and col. 7, lines 9-18 as teaching “a plurality

AUS920010522US1

13

PATENT  
10/058,300

of objects, such as files, having common data attributes are graphically associated, or represented by a plurality of three-dimensional columns of varying height; also, an activity such as changes in the file system, causes corresponding changes in the displayed attributes of the columns.”

[Office Action, p. 2]

In addition, in the rejection to claim 1, the Examiner cites Strasnick as teaching the element of “graphically adjusting a three-dimensional height of the application image in the graphical interface to represent the at least one type of activity, such that the at least one type of activity is graphically distinguished for an application” at col. 2, lines 15-32 and col. 6 lines 43-67 through col. 7, lines 1-18. [Office Action, p. 2] In particular, the Examiner cites col. 2, lines 15-32 and col. 6 lines 43-67 through col. 7, lines 1-18 as teaching “as the data attributes of the data in the files represented by a particular column varies, the height of the three-dimensional column varies accordingly; for example, the height of the column can represent the file size and the columns of the system dynamically responds to changes in the file system, such that changes in the size of the files corresponds to changes in the height of the columns.” [Office Action, pp. 2-3]

Applicants respectfully note that Strasnick teaches a window that displays a plurality of three-dimensional columns of varying height, solely for the purpose of representing data in files. Strasnick does not teach an application image, which represents that an application is open, independent of whether a graphical window through which a user interfaces with the application is currently open within a graphical user interface. In contrast, claim 1 is amended to teach that the activity detected for an application is graphically represented in an application image, where the application “is represented in a graphical interface by an application image and interfaced with through a graphical window, wherein said application image indicates said application is running independent of whether said graphical window for user interfacing with said application is currently open within said graphical user interface”. The specification supports the amendment to claim 1 in Figure 2 and at page 16, lines 13-18 which read:

“Additional application images 60 and 62 are also depicted within window

50. Preferably, each of application images 56, 58, 60 and 62 are displayed to

AUS920010522US1

14

PATENT  
10/058,300

represent an application that is currently open within the system.

Advantageously, an application may be running within a system without displaying windows in association with the application.”

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Strasnick does not teach each element of claim 1 because Strasnick does not teach an application image that represents that an application is open. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 1 and parallel system and program claims 9 and 17, which are amended to reflect the amendments to claim 1.

**Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24**

Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are dependent on independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended for allowance. Thus, Applicants note that claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are dependent upon an allowable independent claim and request allowance of these dependent claims.

AUS920010522US1

15

PATENT  
10/058,300

*Conclusion*

Applicants note the citation of pertinent prior art cited by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment. Further, Applicants reiterate the request for a telephone conference with the Examiner at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



ON 12/8/2004

Amy J. Pattillo  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,983  
P.O. Box 161327  
Austin, TX 78746  
512.402.9820 (phone)  
512.306.0417 (fax)

AUS920010522US1

16